

- MEMBER AGENCIES -

California Department of
Transportation
California Highway Patrol
California State
Association of Counties
League of California Cities
California State Automobile
Association
Automobile Club of Southern
California

California Traffic Control Devices Committee



(916) 654-4715

July 31, 2001

MEMBERS, ALTERNATES AND OBSERVERS CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE (CTCDC)

Enclosed for your information are summarized minutes from the CTCDC meeting held in San Diego, on June 7, 2001. The minutes are also available on the California Department of Transportation website at the following address:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/newtech/>

During the June 7, 2001 CTCDC meeting, the Committee decided to have a workshop to discuss Agenda Item, **01-2, Proposal to Expand the Committee**, as a result of a suggestion to include representatives from the private sector. The workshop will be held on September 26, 2001 (1 p.m. to 5 p.m.) at 1120 N Street, Room 1420, Sacramento, CA 95814, one day prior to the CTCDC meeting. The minutes of the February 15, 2001 meeting, available on the above noted website and these include a discussion on this proposal.

The Committee invites all interested agencies, organizations, and individuals to attend the workshop and provide input on this proposal. If you are unable to attend the workshop, you can provide your comments to the CTCDC Secretary, by mailing to 1120 N Street, MS 36, Sacramento, CA 95814 or by e-mailing the Secretary at Devinder_Singh@dot.ca.gov.

The next CTCDC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 27, 2001. The meeting will be held in the California Department of Food and Agriculture's Auditorium at 1220 N Street, Sacramento, CA 95814. Items to be included in the agenda for the September 27, 2001 meeting need to be submitted no later than August 10, 2001.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Devinder Singh". The signature is written in a cursive style.

DEVINDER SINGH
Executive Secretary, CTCDC

Enclosure

MINUTES
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE (CTCDC)
MEETING

June 7, 2001 IN THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

The second meeting of the CTCDC in 2001 was held in the Auditorium, Caltrans District 11 Office in the City of San Diego on June 7, 2001.

Chairman Ray Mellen opened the meeting at 9 a.m. with the introduction of Committee members and guests. Ray thanked Joel Haven, Caltrans for hosting the meeting. The following members, alternates, and guests were in attendance:

| ATTENDANCE Members (Voting) | ORGANIZATION | TELEPHONE |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| Ray Mellen Chairman | Auto Club Southern California, | (714) 885-2301 |
| Jim Larsen Vice Chairman | CA State Association of Counties County of Tulare | (559) 733-6291 |
| Gerry Meis | Caltrans | (916) 654-4551 |
| Ike Iketani | CHP | (916) 657-7222 |
| Wayne Tanda | League of CA Cities City of San Jose | (408) 277-4945 |
| Merry Banks | California State Automobile Association, Auto Club | (415) 565-2297 |
| Farhad Mansourian | CA State Association of Counties County of Marin | (415) 499-6570 |
| John Fisher | League of CA Cities City of Los Angeles | (213) 580-1189 |

| ALTERNATES | ORGANIZATION | TELEPHONE |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------|------------------|
| Richard Backus | Auto Club Southern California | (714) 885-2326 |
| Mark Greenwood | League of CA Cities City of Palm Desert | (760) 776-6450 |
| ATTENDEES | ORGANIZATION | TELEPHONE |
| Conrad Lapinski | Willdan Associates Pionner, 95666 | ((949) 470-8840 |
| Michael Harrison | LightGuard System, INC | (707) 542-4547 |
| Peter Floodman | LightGuard System, INC | (707) 542-4547 |
| Jason Nutt | Marin County-PWD | (415) 499 6528 |
| Lynn Mack | Polara Engineering Fullerton, CA | (714) 521-0900 |
| Peter Lai | CPUC | (213) 576-7087 |
| Jesus Escamilla | CPUC | (213) 576-7084 |
| Luis Mellender | Caltrans D11 | (619) 220-7356 |
| Robert Carlson | City of Escondido | (760) 839-4595 |
| Jerry Williams | BlinkerStop/TAPCO | (559) 627-1995 |
| Perscilla Willams | BlinkerStop/TAPCO | (559) 627-1995 |
| Blackie Blackstock | San Diego | (619) 232-3483 |
| Chjene Chhor | Blind & Vision-Impaired, San Diego | (619) 583-1542 |
| Amy Gilstrap | Blind & Vision-Impaired, San Diego | (619) 583-1542 |
| Jim Magen | US Traffic Corp. | (800) 733-7872 |
| Matt Schmitz | FHWA | (916) 498-5850 |
| Theresa Gabrial | Caltrans HQ-ITS | (916) 6545653 |
| Martha Styer | Caltrans HQ-ITS | (916) 654-5653 |
| Bill Wald | Caltrans HQ-ITS | (916) 651-9048 |
| Ron Fuchiwaki | City of Simi Valley | (805) 583-6808 |
| Farhad Miran | City of Simi Valley | (805) 583-6796 |
| Ed Wmmer | City of Lemon Grove | (619) 825-3810 |
| Warren Siecke | BREA & Placentia | (714) 990-7742 |
| Amit Kothari | City of Oakland | (510) 238-3469 |
| Lee Ward | Parsons Transp. Group | (626) 440-6100 |
| John Hoxie | Caltrans Legal | (916) 654-2630 |
| Veronica Elsea | Santa Cruz | |

MINUTES

Amendment to the February 15, 2001 minutes:

Wayne Tanda suggested that the alternate members who attend meetings should be shown by the organization they represent and by their employment agency.

MOTION: Moved by Jim Larsen, seconded by Gerry Meis, to adopt the minutes of the CTCDC meeting held on February 15, 2001 in Santa Cruz as amended. Motion Carried 8-0.

Merry Banks requested the Chairman to move Agenda Item 01-7 to the first item on the Agenda because she must leave early to attend another meeting. There was no objection and the item was moved as requested.

AGENDA ITEMS

01-7 PEDESTRIAN COUNTDOWN SIGNAL HEADS

Merry Banks noted that the City of Oakland has requested experimentation with pedestrian countdown signal heads (PCSHs) at 10 intersections. Merry advised the Committee members that the countdown signals in the City of San Francisco are getting positive feedback from users. Merry stated the Oakland experiment would be beneficial for the Committee to reach a final recommendation, because the locations will be tested in heavy pedestrian traffic, such as China Town and Jack London Square.

Ray Mellen pointed out to Committee members that he has received a number of letters that were written in support of the experiment request. Ray asked for comments from the Committee members and the audience.

Richard Skaff, Deputy Director, Physical Accessibility, San Francisco Mayors Office, suggested that Caltrans and local agencies have the responsibility to consider experimenting with devices available for visually impaired pedestrians simultaneously with PCSHs. Richard further advocated that we should not test one system for sighted pedestrians and another system for non sighted pedestrians. Both systems should be

01-7 PEDESTRIAN COUNTDOWN SIGNAL HEADS (continued)

tested together. Barbara Rose, San Jose, asked if the noise level study would be part of this experiment. Merry Banks responded that PCSHs are not for visually impaired pedestrians, therefore, a noise level study will not be a part of this experiment.

Gerry Meis asked Merry Banks if any of the proposed locations are on the State highways. If there is one, then the City of Oakland must work with Caltrans District 4 Office to reach an agreement. Merry Banks responded that she is not aware of that, but, if there is one, the City of Oakland will work with Caltrans District 4 Office.

MOTION: By Gerry Meis, seconded by Jim Larsen, to approve for experimentation, the pedestrian countdown signal heads request submitted by the City of Oakland. The countdown is to start at the flashing "DON'T WALK " and the evaluation is to include the same information requested from the other California cities conducting similar experiments. Motion carried 8-0.

Ray Mellen asked for discussion on the motion. John Fisher stated that the Committee had already approved experimentation for four other cities and no data to date has been submitted to the Committee. Merry Banks responded that the City of San Francisco would be submitting preliminary data during the next CTCDC meeting. John Fisher further stated that the consistency and uniformity is an important factor for all traffic control devices, therefore, the City of Oakland should follow the experimentation outlines recommended by this Committee during the previous approvals on similar devices. Wayne Tanda suggested that Caltrans should write a letter, which contains the experimentation guidelines recommended by the Committee to all the public agencies, who have approval to experiment with countdown signals.

The following two paragraphs provide operating guidelines which the Committee agreed upon at the November 9, 2000 CTCDC meeting:

The countdown should begin at the start of the flashing "Don't Walk" to maintain uniformity. The study should include information regarding its effectiveness, such as the number and percentage of pedestrians illegally entering

01-7 PEDESTRIAN COUNTDOWN SIGNAL HEADS (continued)

the crosswalk on the flashing “Don't Walk” or solid “Don't walk”, during the before and after periods. The study should also include a survey regarding the publics’ comprehension of the simultaneous display of the flashing “Don't Walk” and the countdown display. Specifically, it would be desirable to know what percentage of the public incorrectly interprets the simultaneous display to mean that leaving the curb is legal as long as the pedestrian can complete the crossing before the countdown reaches zero.

The study should also include motorist behavior “before and after.” This behavior could be characterized by the number of cars running yellow and red signals and might indicate whether motorists speed up as a result of this device. In addition to that study, the survey should also include pedestrian behavior, which could be adversely affected by installing these devices. This might include hesitating in the roadway and running as well as returning to the curb after starting to cross.

ACTION: Item completed.

00-4 USE OF RAISED PAVEMENT MARKERS FOR TRANSVERSE PLACEMENT

Ray Mellen noted that this item is a continuation item and asked Jim Larsen to apprise the Committee. Jim stated that during the last CTCDC meeting, Gerry Meis promised to bring draft language on the raised pavement markers (RPMs) for the Committees’ comments. Gerry pointed out that there is a draft in your packet, and the red text is taken from the MUTCD 2000, which will be incorporated into the Traffic Manual. The RPMs are discussed in the Traffic Manual and MUTCD under Section 6-01.3 (Materials) and Section 3B11 (RPM), respectively. John Fisher expressed that the proposed language could be interpreted to use RPMs at the right edge line. John further said that traffic engineers do not recommend the placement of RPMs at the right edge line, because it could mislead drivers to use a shoulder as a travel lane.

00-4 USE OF RAISED PAVEMENT MARKERS FOR TRANSVERSE PLACEMENT (continued)

Wayne Tanda suggested that Caltrans should address the issue raised by John Fisher, and bring this back to the Committee. Gerry noted that Caltrans will clarify the point raised by John and bring back the revised draft to the Committee.

ACTION: Item to be continued.

00-7 MODIFICATION TO THE POLICY OF WINDING ROAD (W14) SIGN

Ray Mellen said this agenda item is also a continuation from the last meeting and asked Jim Larsen, the sponsor, to apprise the Committee. Jim Larsen stated that during the last meeting it was suggested that Caltrans Legal Office, Caltrans District Traffic Engineers, Los Angeles (LA) County Legal Counsel and the interested members of this Committee, to confer and to resolve the issue related to the proposed policy.

Gerry stated that a meeting was held to discuss the proposed policy change presented by LA County and a summary of the meeting is included in the Committee member's packet. Gerry further stated that the participants from Caltrans districts strongly opposed any change to the current policy. The legal counsel from Marin County supported Caltrans' position. Caltrans district participants, including legal counsels, did not recall an incident where the existing policy was the cause of any claim or claims against the State. The Caltrans Statewide Tort Committee further confirmed that statement. Gerry noted that after reviewing all the facts, his position is to not change the current policy, as suggested by LA County.

Farhad Mansourian stated that he and his Legal Counsel participated in the meeting. Farhad further stated that he also had contacted his colleagues from the CTCDC, representing cities and counties to find out if they had any legal issues with the current policy. The responses are included in the Committee member's packet. Farhad concurred with Gerry's statement. Wayne Tanda commented that the policy should be revisited and the appropriate time might be when Caltrans adopts the MUTCD with the California supplement.

00-7 MODIFICATION TO THE POLICY OF WINDING ROAD (W14) SIGN (continued)

Jim Larsen stated that Tulare County has numerous winding roads in its jurisdiction and in his opinion, the proposed policy would not change the signing practice. Jim further stated that he also wants to discuss the policy during the MUTCD adoption and supports the California practice with more clarification. Ray Mellen asked for other comments from the Committee members and the audience. There were none.

MOTION: Moved by Jim Larsen, seconded by Gerry Meis, to keep the current Winding Road (W14) signing policy instead of adopting the policy proposed by LA County. Motion carried 7-1. Wayne Tanda voted against.

ACTION: Item completed.

01-5 ACCESSIBLE PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL

Ray Mellen advised the Committee that during the last CTCDC meeting, the Committee had recommended placing Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APSs) on the agenda for this meeting. Ray asked John Fisher to address the APSs.

John Fisher noted that during the last CTCDC meeting, the City of Santa Cruz was given approval to conduct experimentation with the "Tactile Pedestrian Signals with Audible Information" at five intersections, which are approved official traffic control devices at the national level. The city identified a number of reasons to justify the installation of these devices, such as: mocking birds and chirping sounds bouncing off buildings. John suggested that the Committee should adopt the MUTCD language on APSs into the Traffic Manual. The MUTCD 2000, Section 4E.06, Accessible Pedestrian Signals, allows a number of different options based on the engineering analysis and the need of the blind and visually impaired community. John further stated the language on APSs was developed over a number of years by studies that were reviewed and discussed by different committees, and finally was adopted by the Federal Highway Administration. John noted that a number of other organizations also provided input including the American Counsel of Blind, American Association of the Blind, American Association

01-5 ACCESSIBLE PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL (continued)

for Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired, Association of Design for the Blind and many other individuals who have expertise in this field. John particularly mentioned the names of Dr. Beezee Benson, Lucas Frank, Clara Barton and many others who provided input on the APSs. John stated that it would be wise for the Committee to adopt the MUTCD language into the Traffic Manual, because this is new innovative technology and there is a need for the vibro-tactile information, locator tone, audible tones and verbal message for the pedestrians who are blind, deaf and also to reduce the noise level.

Ray Mellen informed the Committee that he has received correspondence regarding the APSs from Ronda King, City of Red Bluff, A Resolution from the California Council of the Blind (CCB) and from the Association for Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired, and Division Nine-Orientation and Mobility. Some of these supported adopting the MUTCD language, while others suggested establishing a task force to review the MUTCD language and other available studies to make final recommendations. Ray asked for comments from Committee members and the audience.

Gerry Meis stated that current standards call only for the bird sounds for the APSs in California, and he suggests that consistency and uniformity be kept in mind if this Committee adopts the MUTCD language. He also stressed that the blind and the visually impaired community should be in agreement with the new standards.

Helen Elias, Mobility Instructor, Division Nine – Orientation and Mobility, stated that the MUTCD 2000 Edition on APSs, Sections 4E.06 and 4E.08, should be adopted without further delay in California. She also advocated a review of the language from the Public Rights-of-Way Access Advisory Committee Report (PROWAAC) on the “Pedestrian Street Crossing” to incorporate with MUTCD language on APSs. She suggested establishing a task force to review other available studies and reports for future updates of the APSs language. She stressed to adopt the available technology and move on.

Linda Flores representing San Diego blind consumers stated she supports establishment of a task force and wants to see consistency and uniformity. Ray asked if Linda could

01-5 ACCESSIBLE PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL (continued)

give names of the organizations to be included in a task force. Linda suggested that the national organization of blind, blind consumer orientation of the blind and mobility and the daily users of these devices should be included in the task force.

Gene Lozano representing the California Council of the Blind (CCB) and the Sacramento County Disability Advisory Committee stated that current California guidelines on the APSs were created by a task force during the early 1990's and were incorporated in the Traffic Manual, under Section 9-04.8. Existing guidelines do not preclude the manufacturers and agencies from installing vibrotactile and locator tones. It depends upon the individual as to how he interprets the current guidelines. The guidelines are clear only on the birdcall. The two pluses of the current guidelines are; they do not require community consensus, and they provide consistency and standardization.

Gene further said that it is premature to adopt the MUTCD language, because there are conflicts between two federal documents, MUTCD and PROWAAC, which contain the verbiage on the APSs. Gene suggested establishing a task force whose purpose would be to examine the federal documents, MUTCD and PROWAAC and other available studies in making final recommendations on the language of the APSs to be included in the Traffic Manual. Gene suggested that the make-up of the task force should include: CCB; national organization of blind of California; representatives from orientation of blind and mobility, AER and senior citizens. The task force should submit their final recommendation on the language to be included in the Traffic Manual, within the next six months, to this Committee, for consideration.

Alex Beldez said the audio signals are important for the blind and visually impaired pedestrians and strongly recommended adoption of these devices in California. Alex further stated that new technology is a today's "cane" for the blind and visually impaired pedestrians. The spoken words and tactile devices are the new technology and the Committee should adopt these devices without any delay. Alex also advocated for the establishment of the task force, but insisted not to drag the issue out too long. There is a need to adopt these new devices today.

01-5 ACCESSIBLE PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL (continued)

Veronica Elsea, from the City of Santa Cruz, gave an update on the Mission Street experimental project on APSs that was approved by the Committee during the last CTCDC meeting. Veronica suggested that the Committee should adopt the MUTCD language into the Traffic Manual. She stated that the National Manual was developed over a number of years of review, with the involvement of the blind community and with the help of blind experts. Veronica doubted if a task force would do any good, except to prolong the adoption of the new devices in California.

There were a number of others in the audience including blind and visually impaired persons, who spoke on this agenda item (Teddy, Kathy, Richard Skaff, and Barbara Rose). In summary, the speakers concern were consistency, uniformity, and to move on with the new technology. Some speakers stressed the need to establish a task force to make final recommendations on the guidelines of the APSs. Gene stated that the MUTCD does leave a variety of options to be used and every one wants consistency and uniformity. Gene further stated that these devices impact their life and a task force would hammer out the final language.

Also, there was a lengthy discussion between the Committee members. A motion was presented by John Fisher and seconded by Jim Larsen, to adopt the MUTCD language into the Traffic Manual. The motion was later withdrawn, because there are some proposed changes to the APSs language of the MUTCD 2000.

Wayne Tanda asked John Fisher the following question. Since consistency and uniformity is important on all other traffic control devices, how did the national committee come up with the flexibility which allows local jurisdiction to pick and choose any of the devices from verbal, tactile or verbal/audible message? John responded that the text pertaining to the standardization of APSs was modified and expanded, based on extensive input from the blind community and professional experts serving them. This input pointed to the need to allow new devices to fit situations not adequately addressed by the bird chirp sounds alone.

01-5 ACCESSIBLE PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL (continued)

Richard Skaff, Member of the U.S. Access Board stated that ADA requires that all facilities provide equal access. California Code was updated in 1988 to incorporate federal mandate. Richard further stated that the Access Board Report and the MUTCD are two different documents. Wayne asked Richard to clarify these two different Federal documents. Richard responded that the Access Board Report is very specific about the features required where the APSs are provided, while the MUTCD is more flexible on the APSs.

Wayne Tanda suggested that since the APSs language in the MUTCD is open for revision, the Committee should wait for further action. Wayne also asked the different organizations of the blind and visually impaired community, to review the revised MUTCD language, and provide specific comments or suggested language to this Committee for consideration before the next CTCDC meeting.

MOTION: By Farhad Mansourian and seconded by Wayne Tanda, to consider adopting the revised MUTCD 2000 language into the Traffic Manual during the next CTCDC meeting. Motion carried 7-0.

The Committee asked the blind and visually impaired community to provide comments, suggestions or edits to the MUTCD language for the Committee to consider in incorporating language into the Traffic Manual during the next CTCDC meeting.

ACTION: Item to be continued

01-6 SUPPLEMENT SIGN ON CHANNELIZERS

Ray Mellen stated that this agenda item was put on the agenda at the request of John Fisher. Ray asked John to address the Committee. John Fisher stated that the signs on channelizers/delineators have been used for decades in urban areas to supplement standard signs. These signs are also used at intersections to restrict or allow certain movements during certain hours. John noted that Sections 5-05.6 and 6-06.4 of the Traffic Manual, allows channelizer/delineator devices in certain situations to be placed on

01-6 SUPPLEMENT SIGN ON CHANNELIZERS (continued)

lane lines or centerlines. John suggested that the following wording should be added at the end of the Section 4-01.27 of the Traffic Manual:

"When needed for emphasis, small signs not exceeding 12 inches in width may be mounted on channelizers, cones or portable delineators placed on lane lines or centerlines. When installed, they shall supplement permanently mounted standard signs and shall use standard legends, sign color and retroreflectivity, but in a smaller, proportional format."

John further noted that if the Committee approved to add the above paragraph under Section 4-01.27, then paragraph four of Section 10-03.4 would need to be deleted.

Ray Mellen stated that a similar issue was raised at the Palm Desert meeting, last year. Ray further stated that some of these devices are not worthwhile, and in some cases are inconsistent with the Traffic Manual. Ray asked for comments from Committee members.

Wayne Tanda stated that 15 years ago, the City of San Jose was authorized to conduct an experimental evaluation on portable school crossing signs. The city had submitted a report to this Committee and concluded that the signs be authorized for use on a roadway centerline. The report further concluded that large vehicles might obstruct visibility of the signs on lane lines on multilane streets. Wayne further stated he supports Johns' proposal, but would like clarification on the placement of these signs on the lane lines. There was a lengthy discussion to place these signs on the centerline and/or lane lines. John Fisher agreed to change wording from "lane lines or centerline" to "lane lines and/or centerlines".

Jim Larsen noted that the proposed language does not differentiate the type of sign to be used on channelizers/delineators, and this means the sign could be regulatory, warning or guide. Jim further stated that the proposed language does not prohibit signs with aluminum substrate, and that type of sign could be hazardous if separated from the primary device by the impact of a vehicle.

01-6 SUPPLEMENT SIGN ON CHANNELIZERS (continued)

Ray Mellen asked for comments from the audience. Matt Schmitz, FHWA, informed the Committee that the channelizer's devices are Category 1 devices under the NCHRP 350 guidelines. The Category I device, with attachment, becomes a Category II device, which requires an impact test to determine if the device is safe for placement on the National Highway System (NHS). Matt stated that this is for information only, and NCHRP 350 guidelines are not mandated on local highway systems.

MOTION: Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Wayne Tanda, to add the following paragraph under Section 4-01.27 and delete paragraph four of Section 10-03.4 of the Traffic Manual:

"When needed for emphasis, small signs not exceeding 12 inches in width, may be mounted on channelizers, cones or portable delineators placed on lane lines and or centerlines. When installed, they shall supplement permanently mounted standard signs and shall use standard legends, sign color and retroreflectivity, but in a smaller, proportional format."

Motion failed by 5-2, Gerry Meis and Jim Larsen voted against the motion. Six votes are needed to make recommendations to Caltrans for the adoption of an official traffic control device.

John Fisher requested that this item be placed on the agenda for the next CTCDC meeting. John said that he would welcome suggestions from Committee members to modify the proposal. The Committee members were in agreement to place the item on the agenda for the next CTCDC meeting.

ACTION: Item to be placed on agenda for the next CTCDC meeting.

01-8 IN-ROADWAY FLASHING LED RED LIGHTS AT R/R CROSSING

Ray Mellen introduced Ron Fuchiwaki, City of Simi Valley, and asked him to brief the Committee about their experiment request. Ron told the Committee that the City of Simi Valley has a median housing project that requires realignment of the existing R/R crossing, which exists at the dirt road. As part of the permit approval process, the California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) requires the installation of gates, advance flashing lights and raised islands. In addition to that, the CPUC also is requiring installation of in-roadway flashing LED red lights under experimentation. Ron stated that this is the reason the City of Simi Valley submitted an application for the experiment.

Ray Mellen invited Peter Lai, representing CPUC, to comment on this experimentation request. Peter informed the Committee that CPUC's new policy is no new R/R crossings at grade. If a new R/R crossing is proposed, it must be as a grade separation. Peter stated CPUC required that the City of Simi Valley install in-roadway warning lights (IRWLs) in addition to other standard devices, because IRWLs have been proven successful at pedestrian crosswalks. The CPUC would like to see if IRWLs produce positive results at grade R/R crossings.

Ray asked Peter, how could it be proven that IRWLs at this location have positive results? Ray further stated that if there is no "before" data how could you measure success? Peter responded that even though there is no before data motorists could provide feedback, if the devices have any positive impact on their driving behavior. Ray asked Matt Schmitz, if he has any input from FHWA. Matt responded that he is not aware of any experimentation underway by FHWA.

John Fisher asked Peter if devices at the R/R crossings, such as gates, or flashing lights are considered to be R/R crossing devices and maintained by the R/R Company. John further asked if IRWLs should be a part of R/R crossing devices and be under the railroad jurisdiction. Peter responded that at this time, IRWLs are not an approved traffic control device at R/R crossings, and it has not been proven that they will have a positive impact on motorists. When the devices are proven to have positive results, the CPUC will work

01-8 IN-ROADWAY FLASHING LED RED LIGHTS AT R/R CROSSING (continued)

with R/R companies to make IRWLs a part of the R/R crossing device. Until then, the CPUC cannot ask that these devices be considered standard R/R crossing devices.

Peter informed the Committee that the CPUC has received a grant from the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) to conduct experimentation with the IRWLs at the four R/R crossings. Peter further advised that he is preparing a packet to submit an experiment request to the CTCDC and the FHWA.

Wayne Tanda stated that he would support the experiment study, if it was submitted as a package and one report would be prepared for all the locations. Wayne further stated that the Committee should allow CPUC to be an applicant for this experiment, because the CTCDC guidelines allow other state agencies to conduct an experiment on new traffic control devices. In summary, Committee members asked a number of questions of Peter in relation to the experiment and also why these devices should not be part of R/R crossing devices. Also, the Committee members noted that there is no before data available at the proposed location, therefore, the success of an experiment could not be measured.

Peter said he is willing to withdraw the condition for Simi Valley to install IRWLs as a requirement for permit approval. However, in future if the City of Simi Valley has before data, they should be allowed to conduct an experiment with IRWLs. Ray Mellen asked for comments from the audience.

Matt Schmitz, FHWA, stated that even though the CTCDC could allow CPUC as the applicant for the experiment, FHWA will require the owner of the roadway to be a part of the applicant for the experimentation.

MOTION: By Jim Larsen, seconded by John Fisher, to deny the experiment request with IRWLs at the R/R crossing submitted by the City of Simi Valley. Motion Carried 7-0.

Wayne Tanda stated that the minutes should reflect the reason for denying the request for the experiment submitted by the City of Simi Valley. The reason being the CPUC is in

01-8 IN-ROADWAY FLASHING LED RED LIGHTS AT R/R CROSSING (continued)

the process of submitting a larger package, which includes a number of locations to conduct an experiment with IRWLs.

ACTION: Item completed

TABLED ITEM

94-10 PEDESTRIAN COUNTDOWN SIGNAL HEADS

Ray Mellen reminded the Committee that during the last CTCDC meeting, the Committee had suggested writing a letter to the County of Sacramento, requesting an update on the status of the experimentation. Gerry Meis told the Committee that Caltrans would send a draft letter for Committee members to review before the chairman signed it.

01-2 PROPOSAL TO EXPAND THE COMMITTEE

The Committee decided to hold a workshop to discuss this proposal on September 26, 2001, from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m. The workshop will be held in Caltrans Headquarters Office at 1120 N Street, Room 1420, Sacramento. The cover letter of the minutes of the June 7, 2001 will invite local agencies, traffic engineers and individuals to participate in the workshop and provide comments and suggestions. Comments and suggestions can also be sent to the Executive Secretary of the CTCDC by using the following e-mail:

Devinder_Singh@dot.ca.gov or by Telephone at (916) 654-4715.

DISCUSSION ITEM

01-A VIDEO ENFORCED SIGN

Ray Mellen asked Gerry Meis to address this item. Gerry Meis invited Ed Norris, City of Long Beach, Acting City Engineer, to address the Committee on a proposed "Video Enforced" sign. Ed told the Committee that from a Traffic Engineers perspective, the "Video Enforced" sign would be more effective to the currently used "Photo Enforced" (SR56) sign. Ed further stated that the "Video Enforced" sign would replace the currently used "Photo Enforced" sign when video technology is used.

Ray Mellen inquired about the need to change the sign. Is there an enforcement problem or is the existing sign not holding up in court? Ed invited Jeff Keelander, representing the vendor for the "Video Enforced" sign to respond. Jeff responded that he is not aware of any legal issue. Jeff informed the Committee that the "Video Enforced" system has additional equipment, which supplements a "Photo Enforced" system, this could be used in the courts, if the violation is challenged.

Gerry Meis informed the Committee that when Caltrans develops standards for signs, which are covered by the Statue, Caltrans makes every effort to be consistent with the language written in the law. He stated that the law uses the word "Photographic" in this situation.

John Fisher stated that if there is no legal problem with the current sign, and there is not a demonstrated need to change the sign, then there does not appear to be justification for a new sign. Jeff Keelander agreed with the Committee's comments and said that at this time he will not pursue this further unless there are legal issues.

No further action needed.

INFORMATION ITEMS

99-11 MUTCD ADOPTION BY CALTRANS

Ray Mellen asked Gerry Meis to update the Committee on the status of the California Supplement to the MUTCD. Gerry invited Johnny Bhullar to address the Committee. Johnny provided a handout to Committee members, which outlined the estimated time period to complete the task. The handout also contained outlines for local agencies to follow, until the MUTCD is developed. Johnny informed the Committee that a website had been developed to post the latest information in regards to this task. Johnny also passed out a few samples of MUTCD Supplements developed by other states, as requested by Committee members during the last CTCDC meeting.

BLINKERSTOP SIGN

Gerry Meis stated that Caltrans might request authorization to conduct experimentation with the BlinkerStop sign on rural State highways, where power is not available. Gerry invited Dale Jones representing TAPCO Corporation to address the Committee. Dale told the Committee that during the last CTCDC meeting, the Committee asked Caltrans to determine if the BlinkerStop sign is a new traffic control device. Caltrans has determined that the BlinkerStop sign is a new traffic control device as well as a new product. Dale informed the Committee that a number of local agencies showed interest in installing BlinkerStop signs under experimentation, and during the next CTCDC meeting those agencies will follow the guidelines for the experimentation process. Dale asked to place the BlinkerStop sign on the agenda for the next CTCDC meeting. The Committee suggested that Dale work with Gerry Meis and with the Secretary of the Committee to place this item on the agenda for the next CTCDC meeting.

DON'T PASS WHEN RED LIGHTS FLASHING

Officer John Olejnik, CHP, asked the Committee to place the “Don’t Pass When Red Lights Flashing” sign on the agenda for the next CTCDC meeting. Officer Olejnik informed the Committee that Marin County would submit a request to conduct experimentation with this sign. Wayne Tanda questioned the need to experiment. Caltrans could develop the sign standard and specification because this sign has already been used on school buses. Gerry responded that he is not in favor of creating signs for every law to remind motorists, unless the sign has a positive impact on the motoring public. Gerry further said that the Marin County CHP presented “before” data during the last CTCDC meeting and the success or failure of the sign could be easily measured from “after” data. The Committee agreed to place this item on the agenda for the next CTCDC meeting, if a request is submitted by the agency conducting experimentation.

OFF THE AGENDA ITEM

Ray Mellen introduced Kim Day, Deputy Executive Director, Los Angeles World Airport to the Committee members. Kim briefed the Committee about proposed signage for the Los Angeles World Airport. Kim told the Committee that the proposed signage program will provide new roadway guide signs to establish consistency and provide clearer directions to LAX bound motorists. The proposed signs will be installed on Sepulveda Boulevard (SR-1) and Century Boulevard. Kim requested placing this issue on the next CTCDC Agenda meeting. The Committee agreed to this.

NEXT MEETING

The next CTCDC meeting will be held on September 27, 2001, in the Auditorium of the California Department of Food & Agriculture Building, at 1220 N Street, Sacramento. There will be a workshop on September 26, 2001, from 1 PM to 5 PM to discuss the agenda item 01-2, Expansion of the CTCDC. This workshop will be held at 1120 N Street, Room 1420, Sacramento, CA 95814

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 PM.